

III. REMARKS

Claims 3-5 and 27-38 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 3 and 34 have been amended; claims 37-38 have been added; and no claims have been cancelled. Applicants are not conceding in this application that any claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious allowance of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Status

In the Office Action Summary, the Examiner indicates that claims 1-5 and 27-36 are pending and stand rejected (Disposition of Claims, items 4 and 6). Applicants wish to confirm and clarify that claims 1-2 were previously cancelled.

Support for New Claims

New claim 37 finds support in the specification in at least, e.g., p. 13, lines 15-18; and p. 16, lines 22-26. New claim 38 finds support in the specification in at least, e.g., p. 14, line 5 through p. 15, line 6, and p. 15, lines 16-19.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, claim 3 is rejected under § 112, first and second paragraphs, as allegedly claiming subject matter not enabled by the description in the specification, and further for being allegedly indefinite. Claims 4-5 and 27-36 are rejected by virtue of their dependency on claim 3.

Claim 3 is amended herein to recite, in relevant part, “a connection managing unit for allowing connection of said client terminals according to said order of connection, upon

receiving a second connection request from the first client terminal of said client terminals after said first connection request; wherein the connection managing unit transmits a program to the first client in response to the refusal to grant the first connection request, wherein the first client terminal executes the program, and wherein execution of the program by the first client terminal causes the second connection request to be automatically executed again by the first client terminal after a predetermined time interval” (claim 3). Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendments improve the clarity and definiteness of claim 3. Further, Applicants submit that claim 3 as presented herein is enabled by the specification in, among other passages, p. 11, line 11 through p. 12, line 2. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3 and claims 4-5 and 27-38 which depend therefrom meet the requirements of § 112.

Claim 34 is additionally amended to recite “*the* connection queue data holding section” to improve antecedent basis, and to include improved punctuation.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 3-5 and 27-36 are rejected under § 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Bhoj (US Pat. 6,742,016) in view of Roberts *et al.* (US Pat. 6,754,693). Despite Applicants’ traversal of the rejections, Applicants have amended claim 3 herein to provide improved clarity, and respectfully submit that the proposed combination of Bhoj and Roberts fails to teach or suggest each of the claimed features.

For example, Applicants submit that Bhoj and Roberts fail to teach or suggest a server for accepting connection requests from client terminals through a network including, *inter alia*,

a connection-order setting unit which, upon receiving a first connection request from a first client terminal of said client terminals, and in response to a refusal to grant the first connection request, sets an order of connection for said first client terminal; and a connection managing unit for allowing connection of said client terminals according to said order of connection, upon receiving a

second connection request from the first client terminal of said client terminals after said first connection request; *wherein the connection managing unit transmits a program to the first client in response to the refusal to grant the first connection request, wherein the first client terminal executes the program, and wherein execution of the program by the first client terminal causes the second connection request to be automatically executed again by the first client terminal after a predetermined time interval.*

In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Bhoj does not teach or suggest that “*the connection managing unit transmits a program to the first client ... wherein the first client terminal executes the program, and wherein execution of the program by the first client terminal causes the second connection request to be automatically executed again by the first client terminal after a predetermined time interval.*” (Office Action, p. 7), a statement with which Applicants agree.

Applicants submit, however, that Roberts fails to cure this deficiency in Bhoj for at least the following reasons. In a variety of passages cited by the Office, Roberts teaches that that an automated call distributor (ACD) may “inform [a] customer [who calls] the time the customer can expect to be on hold” (col. 1, lines 45-46). Further, call requests from user computers may be routed to a queue which may be displayed selectively on one or more computers, and the server may route call requests using various methods including first-come, first-served, or, e.g., according to computer attributes which may be collected by prompting the user or by a user applet which extracts the attributes from the user computer. (Col. 5, lines 20-32.) The user applet 22 is adapted to enable the user computer 12 to communicate through the network 16 with the server 20, and to establish a link for a visual communication session between users of user computer 12 and second computer 24. (Col. 7, lines 35-49.) Roberts’ user applet 22 and service applet 30, however, are not used to automatically execute a second connection request after a

predetermined time interval as claimed in claim 3. Further, Roberts' applet 22 and service applet 30 are clearly not "transmit[ted] ... to the first client in response to the refusal to grant the first connection request" as claimed herein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that because neither Bhoj nor Roberts teaches or suggests each feature of the server of claim 3, including the foregoing features, claim 3 is patentable over the cited art.

With regard to claims 4-5 and 27-38, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable for reasons stated above relative to independent claim 3, as well as for their own additional claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to claims 4-5 and 27-36.

IV. CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the Application as presented is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Jayme M. Torelli
Reg. No. 62,735

Date: August 17, 2011

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
Phone: (518) 449-0044
Fax: (518) 449-0047